



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Czar though this is not proven. Events have followed each other with great rapidity since this bold movement of the Greek king. A small "corps of occupation" has been landed in Crete under command of Prince George and Colonel Vassos. The military forces of Greece have been brought as speedily as possible into readiness for war. The whole of Greece has been in a state of extraordinary excitement, and unanimously upheld the policy inaugurated by the King. At Constantinople also rapid preparations for war have been made, and the declaration made to the powers that unless Greece desists an army of invasion will be marched against her northern frontier. Greece has declared that she "accepts full responsibility for her acts," and that she will meet the Turks on the frontier if they come.

The powers appeared promptly on the scene. Their warships have blockaded Crete. They have taken possession of three Cretan towns, Canea, Heraklion and Retimo. They have tried to prevent Greece and Turkey both from sending troops or supplies to the island. Their action in bombarding the camp of the insurgents, who, in spite of warnings, attacked the town of Canea, has created the greatest indignation throughout Crete and Greece, and made the movement for union all the stronger and more stubborn.

At this writing Greece stands to her declarations. The island is occupied by Col. Vassos in the name of the King of Greece. All the provinces of Crete have voted for union. The powers have been a good deal at a loss and at some variance as to what to do. They seem determined to prevent war if they can, but not much disposed to allow Crete to get away from Turkey. Lord Salisbury announced in the House of Lords on the 25th ult. that he had sent a despatch to the British representative at the capital of each of the powers, declaring England's policy, with which he assumed the other powers to agree, to be that of administrative autonomy for Crete but as a part of the Turkish Empire; and that in case either Greece or Turkey should decline to remove their troops from the island, at the request of the powers, they should be compelled by force to do so. It remains to be seen whether this policy will be carried out. It would be much better than nothing, but now that the crisis is on, it seems that it would be a very simple thing for the powers to let Crete go where she wants to be and where she naturally belongs. If they feel it their duty to compel Turkey to do anything, why not compel her to do the right thing? The "Concert of Europe" will have to experience "a change of heart" and have a good deal of elementary moral instruction before we shall have any hope of its doing much for civilization and progress. We do not wonder that Gladstone is "sorrowful and indignant" and that the English Liberals look with grave concern on the policy outlined by the Prime Minister.

MR. COUDERT'S CHICAGO SPEECH.

One of the great meetings on the 22nd of February this year in honor of Washington was that held in the Auditorium at Chicago, under the auspices of the Union League Club of that city. The address was given by Frederick R. Coudert, to an immense audience. The chief part of it was given to the progress of arbitration and the passing of war. He predicted that general arbitration is inevitable, and once established by the United States and Great Britain, who "are striving to crown the glories of this dying century with something better and greater than the world has seen," it will be adopted by all the great European powers. Speaking of the Geneva arbitration, he said:

"There are few more hopeful signs in the history of arbitration than that between Great Britain and the United States, which is known as the Geneva arbitration. It is the most conspicuous instance of a resort to friendly adjustment where provocation was so great, for our people had indeed suffered under a real and bitter grievance. When the very existence of the nation was in jeopardy, when brother was arrayed against brother and the whole fabric of our government was tottering to possible ruin, a friendly nation connived at efforts of the union's enemies and indirectly aided in their attempts at our disruption. If there is anything more difficult to forgive than injury we have suffered it is the injury we have inflicted. Since this great object lesson in international arbitration, it is idle to talk of insurmountable obstacles in the way of promoting peace. If the United States could condone the depredations of the Alabama, and Great Britain could pay for them, as she did, arbitration must be easy. But it was never so easy as to-day."

He declared that all the civilization of our age, its intelligence and learning, its science and art, its greater tenderness of human life, its commercial interests, are against war. On the whole also the influence of the press is for peace. General Sherman's monosyllabic description, "war is hell," he thought could scarcely be improved on. Referring to the opinions of Hegel, De Maistre, Von Moltke and others, that war is a divine agency for good, he asked:

"How many soldiers should be slain and how many villages burned and how many provinces devastated before the highest culture is reached? When and how can we be certain that decadence is stayed and that the progress requires no further killing of men? Who shall furnish periodical and plausible pretexts for war, to be applied when the necessity arrives, not that justice may have her sway, but that men may not be pampered into effeminacy by the charms of peace? We might ask this great warrior (Von Moltke) when he discovered, and how, that war entered into the views and designs of Providence. What winged messenger of the Prince of Peace vouchsafed for his private illumination the fearful fact that war was permitted to nations worthy of fulfilling upon earth a divine mission to preserve them from decay? If we can feel quite sure that this accomplished soldier was really inspired to express such appalling sentiments we must despair of the future of the world."

The report of what Mr. Coudert said on the subject of national honor is so exceptionally good that we give nearly the whole of it.

"A nation's honor, I would venture to say, is never compromised by temperance or injured by forbearance. A nation's honor is not served by rash counsels nor by violent impulses recklessly indulged in. It is indeed a frail and delicate possession if it cannot live in an atmosphere of peace, it is a dangerous one if it is tarnished by friendly discussion and a disposition to hearken to the voice of justice.

National honor may, perhaps, shine all the brighter when a great nation is slow to admit that her just dignity may be imperiled by the act of others. The honor of a nation is in her keeping, not in that of her neighbors; it cannot be lost save by her own act. To preserve her honor should be her main object and purpose, but she should not readily believe those who tell her that by hard blows alone may her integrity be protected.

A nation's honor consists in fidelity to her engagements, in carrying out her contracts in spirit as in the letter, in paying her just debts, in respecting the rights of others, in promoting the welfare of her people, in the encouragement of truth, in teaching obedience to the law, in cultivating honorable peace with the world.

How can our national honor be so grievously invaded that there can be no room for remonstrance, no time for discussion, no opportunity allowed the aggressor for amendment? Spain within a few years offended Germany most grievously and, it was said, insulted her flag, but Germany nevertheless arbitrated with Spain and allowed the pope to decide the question at issue. Has Germany's honor suffered thereby?

We seized British ships in the Behring sea and condemned them in our ports—a most grievous insult according to the sensitive and self-constituted custodians of British honor, but Great Britain adopted peaceful counsels, and a wise court heard, examined and decided the case without any apparent injury to British honor.

Why is war a more reliable defender of our national honor than arbitration? Readiness to fight may serve to prove that our country is not afraid to fight, but the world knows that today and needs no proof. War may prove that we have a gallant people behind our government ready to spend life and fortune for a good cause, but the world knows that of old. Why renew the proof? War may show that our financial resources are practically inexhaustible, and that we are able to build and buy the most approved engines of destruction, but that, too, is of public notoriety.

Let us not call witnesses where the facts are conceded, nor embark upon expensive methods to satisfy the world of what the world is already quite convinced. As with men honor often means pride unembarrassed by scruples, so it may be with a nation.

The standard with men differs according to latitude and surroundings, to social institutions and traditions, to civilization, religion and many things. Men resort to the shotgun, the revolver, the bowie knife or the club to heal or defend their honor, and lose it as often as they mend it.

The effort of civilization has been for years to teach them that violence is not the safest champion of offended dignity, that the methods of the bravo, the manners of the ruffian or the tyranny of the bully may best be dealt with

by a firm court and an officer of the law. Why should nations be prompt to seek redress through force so long as reason may be heard and reason's voice is still respected?

Bluster, with nations as with individuals, is dying out. It is heard at times, but its voice squeaks and shows senility. It cannot, as of old, arouse a nation into unthinking wrath nor drive it from propriety. The wisdom and the experience of the world are against it. It was a favorite saying of Napoleon—he had borrowed it from Montesquieu—that no man is strong enough to fight against the nature of things. It will get the best of him in the end, for the moral forces of nature are based on immutable and eternal principles; they will not be put down. They may be delayed, but they cannot be stayed."

He declared that "the day has gone by when honorable preferment could only be gained in war. The splendid triumphs of peace are winning over the heart of man from the glories of war. Perhaps the boy of to-day, by the time he has cast his first vote, may think it as well to be an Edison as a Napoleon, a Pasteur as a Wellington, a Franklin as a Von Moltke, to build as to destroy, to save as to kill, to love as to hate. The prejudices, caprices, errors and passions of men may defer the hour of the triumph of peace, but come it must."

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Ex-Senator Edmunds, whose letter giving his first impressions of the Olney-Pauncefoot Treaty we gave in our last issue, has written for the *New York Independent* (February 4) a fuller exposition of his views, in the line of his letter. This exposition leaves little ground under any of the objections which have been made to the treaty, and makes nearly all of the amendments offered in the Senate seem either entirely useless or positively harmful. Senator Turpie was so impressed with the ability and soundness of Mr. Edmunds' position that he read the whole of the Ex-Senator's article during his speech on the treaty, and spent half an hour commenting on it. Mr. Edmunds ranks as one of the very first constitutional and international lawyers in the nation, and his opinion has had much weight both in the Senate and out of it.

On the 8th of February, Senator Sherman presented to the Senate a partial list of the arbitrations between the United States and other powers. The Senate ordered the list printed. It is Senate document 116 of the 54th Congress. The list covers sixteen arbitrations between the United States and Great Britain, two with Mexico, two with Portugal, three with Colombia, two with Chile, one with Paraguay, one with Costa Rica, two with Ecuador, three with Peru, two with Venezuela, one with Brazil, two with Spain, one with France, and one with Denmark. This list of arbitrations, thirty-nine in all, does not include all the cases to which the United States